First named inventor: Oakeson   Page 8
Serial no. 09/873,194
Filed 6/5/2001
Attorney docket no. 10005667-1

<div style="text-align:center">REMARKS</div>

Claim rejections under 35 USC 103 as to claims 1-2 and 6-7

Claims 1-2 and 6-7 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huberman (6,078,906) in view of Sklut (5,790,119). Claim 1 is an independent claim, from which claims 2 and 6-7 ultimately depend. Applicant submits that as previously presented, claim 1 is patentable over Huberman in view of Sklut, such that claims 2 and 6-7 are patentable over Huberman in view of Sklut as well.

The Examiner has stated that Huberman teaches all the limitations of the claimed invention of claim 1, except for the following limitations:

[1] the job ticket service storing the job ticket related to the job request stores the job ticket *as an object* on a storage;

[2] the job ticket service storing *a job identifier of the object* identifying the job request to which the job ticket is related, and the job ticket service storing *a service identifier of the object* identifying the job ticket service storing the job ticket;

[3] the job ticket service storing *a task section of the object* defining the job ticket, and the job ticket service storing *a control data section of the object* including at least programming to complete the job ticket; and,

[4] the job ticket as stored as the object *accessed by the client*.

Instead, the Examiner has found that Sklut teaches these limitations, such that Huberman in view of Sklut has been stated as rendering the claimed invention obvious.

Applicant respectfully submits that Sklut does not teach each of these four limitations, as limited in the claim, such that Huberman in view of Sklut does not render the claimed invention obvious. "*All words in a claim* must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." (MPEP sec. 2143.03, citing In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).) That is, "all claim limitations must be taught or suggested." (Id.)

First named inventor: Oakeson   Page 9
Serial no. 09/873,194
Filed 6/5/2001
Attorney docket no. 10005667-1

Applicant now discusses how each of these limitations is not found in Sklut, such that Huberman

in view of Sklut does not render the claimed invention obvious.[1]

[1] Job ticket service storing the job ticket as an object

The first limitation in question is the job ticket service (in particular) storing the job ticket

(in particular) as an object. The Examiner has stated that Sklut teaches this limitation in its

Abstract; in column 5, line 52 through column 7, line 51; in column 13, line 65 through column

14, line 17; and, in column 15, lines 30-53. With respect to the Abstract of Sklut, Sklut makes no

mention of objects; therefore, Sklut cannot be said to disclose a job ticket service storing a job

ticket as an object in its Abstract.

With respect to column 5, line 52 through column 7, line 51, this part of Sklut relevantly

discloses the following:

> The concept of employing an object-oriented workflow model to facilitate data
> processing is disclosed in the following journal article . . . . The above-mentioned
> journal article is directed to a model for collaborative work that provides for the
> decomposition of a collaborative process into units of work, the relative scheduling
> of these units of work, the flexible assignment and routing of work to people who
> will perform the work, and the presentation and manipulation of documents (or
> other data) needed in the context of performing the work. This collaborative
> process model . . . is implemented as an object-oriented network *service*.

---

[1] Applicant recognizes that the instant rejection was proffered over a combination of references

under 35 USC 103, and that attacking a single reference is not appropriate where the rejection

was made as to a combination of references. That said, Applicant is not attacking a single

reference. Rather, by showing how none of the references (particularly Sklut) discloses the claim

language under consideration, Applicant is traversing the rejection as a whole, by attacking all of

the references in combination. That is, insofar as Sklut in particular does not disclose this claim

language, and where no other cited prior art reference discloses the amended claim language, the

claimed invention is patentable over any combination of the cited prior art.

First named inventor: Oakeson   Page 10
Serial no. 09/873,194
Filed 6/5/2001
Attorney docket no. 10005667-1

(Col. 6, ll. 9-31) This disclosure of Sklut, however, does not disclose a job ticket service storing a job ticket as an *object*. At best, it appears that Sklut says that a *service* can be implemented as an object (i.e., consider the disclosure relating to an "object-oriented network *service*"). Therefore, at best, and without employing impermissible hindsight, Sklut does not disclose a job ticket service storing a job ticket as an object, but rather discloses a job ticket service being implemented as an object. Thus, with respect to column 5, line 52 through column 7, line 51, this part of Sklut cannot be said to disclose a job ticket service storing a job ticket as an object.

With respect to column 13, line 65 through column 14, line 17, this part of Sklut relevantly discloses the following:

> Workstation 82 includes an object oriented *user interface* (UI) 142 that uses icons and windows to represents various data objects and user applications such as a display illustrating an office desktop metaphor employing various abstractions of a typical office environment. *User interfaces using windows and icons having an* object oriented methodology to present metaphors for maintaining data, navigating through various user spaces and presenting abstract computer concepts are well known . . . .

(Col. 13, l. 65, through col. 14, l. 9) This disclosure of Sklut again does not disclose a job ticket service storing a job ticket as an object. In this excerpt of Sklut, Sklut is discussing having an *object-oriented* user interface that presents various metaphors for maintaining data. However, a *user interface* is not a *job ticket service* as to which the claimed invention is limited, and the *user interface* in Sklut is not described anywhere as actually storing *a job ticket* as an object, as to which the claimed invention is also limited. That is, this excerpt of Sklut does not disclose a particular service, such as a job ticket service as in the claimed invention, actually *storing a job ticket as an object*, as to which the claimed invention is limited. Thus, with respect to column 13, line 65 through column 14, line 17, this part of Sklut also cannot be said to disclose a job ticket service storing a job ticket as an object.

With final respect to column 15, lines 30-53 of Sklut, this part of Sklut relevantly discloses the following:

First named inventor: Oakeson   Page 11
Serial no. 09/873,194
Filed 6/5/2001
Attorney docket no. 10005667-1

> In this text tool description, the pronounces "I" and "my" were used in a specific (object-oriented) manner to indicate that each *service*, as proposed here, must be treated as autonomous individuals . . . .

(Col. 15, ll. 31-34) This disclosure of Sklut also does not disclose a job ticket service storing a job ticket as an object. Rather, at best, it appears that Sklut says that each *service* can be implemented as an object. Therefore, at best, and without employing impermissible hindsight, Sklut does not disclose a job ticket service storing a job ticket as an object, but rather discloses a job ticket service being implemented as an object. Thus, with respect to column 15, lines 31-34, this part of Sklut cannot be said to disclose a job ticket service storing a job ticket as an object.

[2] Job ticket service storing job identifier and service identifier of object

The second limitation in question is that the job ticket service (in particular) stores a job identifier (in particular) of the object, where the job identifier identifies the job request to which the job ticket (represented by the object) is related, and that the job ticket service stores a service identifier (in particular) of the object, where the service identifier identifies the job ticket service (in particular) that is storing the job ticket. The Examiner has again stated that Sklut teaches this limitation in its Abstract; in column 5, line 52 through column 7, line 51; in column 13, line 65 through column 14, line 17; and, in column 15, lines 30-53. With respect to the Abstract of Sklut, as noted above, Sklut makes no mention of objects; therefore, Sklut cannot be said to disclose a job ticket service that stores a job identifier and a service identifier of the object as limited in the claim language.

With respect to column 5, line 52 through column 7, line 51, as noted above, this excerpt of Sklut says that a *service* can be implemented as an object, as opposed to a service storing a *job ticket* as an object. Sklut does not say here that a *service* stores a job identifier identifying a job request and a service identifier identifying the service. Indeed, insofar Sklut implements the service as an object in this excerpt – as opposed to implementing the job ticket itself as an object – it does not make sense to say that Sklut would store a service identifier identifying the job ticket

First named inventor: Oakeson   Page 12
Serial no. 09/873,194
Filed 6/5/2001
Attorney docket no. 10005667-1

service storing the object, insofar as the object in Sklut represents (at best) the job ticket service already, and not the job ticket as in the claimed invention. Thus, with respect to column 5, line 52 through column 7, line 51, this part of Sklut cannot be said to disclose a job ticket service storing a job identifier and a service identifier of an object that represents a job ticket.

With respect to column 13, line 65 through column 14, line 17, as noted above, this excerpt of Sklut simply says that the *user interface* can be implemented as an object. Sklut does not say here that a *service* stores a job identifier and a service identifier of an object that represents a job ticket. Disclosure of implementation of a user interface in an object-oriented manner does not particularly disclose a job ticket service storing job and service identifiers of an object representing a job ticket, as to which the claimed invention is limited. Thus, with respect to column 13, line 65 through column 14, line 17, this part of Sklut cannot be said to disclose a job ticket service storing a job identifier and a service identifier of an object that represents a job ticket.

With final respect to column 15, lines 30-53 of Sklut, as noted above, this excerpt of Sklut also says that a *service* can be implemented as an object, as opposed to a service storing a *job ticket* as an object. Sklut does not say here that a *service* stores a job identifier identifying a job request and a service identifier identifying the service. Indeed, insofar Sklut implements the service as an object in this excerpt – as opposed to implementing the job ticket itself as an object – it does not make sense to say that Sklut would store a service identifier identifying the job ticket service storing the object, insofar as the object in Sklut represents (at best) the job ticket service already, and not the job ticket as in the claimed invention. Thus, with respect to column 15, lines 30-53, this part of Sklut cannot be said to disclose a job ticket service storing a job identifier and a service identifier of an object that represents a job ticket.

First named inventor: Oakeson
Serial no. 09/873,194
Filed 6/5/2001
Attorney docket no. 10005667-1

Page 13

[3] Job ticket service storing task section and control data section of object

The third limitation in question is that the job ticket service (in particular) stores a task section (in particular) of the object, where the job section defines the job ticket (represented by the object), and that the job ticket service stores a control data section (in particular) of the object, where the control data section includes programming to complete the job ticket (represented by the object). The Examiner has again stated that Sklut teaches this limitation in its Abstract; in column 5, line 52 through column 7, line 51; in column 13, line 65 through column 14, line 17; and, in column 15, lines 30-53. With respect to the Abstract of Sklut, as noted above, Sklut makes no mention of objects; therefore, Sklut cannot be said to disclose a job ticket service storing job section defining the job ticket represented by the object or a control data section including the programming to complete the job ticket represented by the object.

With respect to column 5, line 52 through column 7, line 51, as noted above, this excerpt of Sklut says that a *service* can be implemented as an object, as opposed to a service storing a *job ticket* as an object. Sklut does not say here that a *service* stores a task section defining the job ticket represented by the object, or a control data section including programming to complete the job ticket represented by the object. Indeed, insofar Sklut implements the service as an object in this excerpt – as opposed to implementing the job ticket itself as an object – it does not make sense to say that Sklut would include within the object information defining a job ticket (e.g., a task section), since the job ticket is separate from the service, or programming to complete the job ticket (e.g., a control data section), since again the job ticket is separate from the service. Thus, with respect to column 5, line 52 through column 7, line 51, this part of Sklut cannot be said to disclose a job ticket service storing job section defining the job ticket represented by the object or a control data section including the programming to complete the job ticket represented by the object.

With respect to column 13, line 65 through column 14, line 17, as noted above, this excerpt of Sklut simply says that the *user interface* can be implemented as an object. Sklut does

First named inventor: Oakeson   Page 14
Serial no. 09/873,194
Filed 6/5/2001
Attorney docket no. 10005667-1

not say here that a *service* stores a task section and a control data section of an object that
represents a job ticket, where the task section defines the job ticket and the control data section
includes programming to complete the job ticket.   Disclosure of implementation of a user
interface in an object-oriented manner does not particularly disclose a job ticket service storing
task and control data sections of an object representing a job ticket, as to which the claimed
invention is limited.   Thus, with respect to column 13, line 65 through column 14, line 17, this
part of Sklut cannot be said to disclose a job ticket service storing job section defining the job
ticket represented by the object or a control data section including the programming to complete
the job ticket represented by the object.

         With final respect to column 15, lines 30-53 of Sklut, as noted above, this excerpt of Sklut
also says that a *service* can be implemented as an object, as opposed to a service storing a *job
ticket* as an object.   Sklut does not say here that a *service* stores a task section defining the job
ticket represented by the object, or a control data section including programming to complete the
job ticket represented by the object.   Indeed, insofar Sklut implements the service as an object in
this excerpt – as opposed to implementing the job ticket itself as an object – it does not make
sense to say that Sklut would include within the object information defining a job ticket (e.g., a
task section), since the job ticket is separate from the service, or programming to complete the job
ticket (e.g., a control data section), since again the job ticket is separate from the service.   Thus,
with respect to column 15, lines 30-53, this part of Sklut cannot be said to disclose a job ticket
service storing job section defining the job ticket represented by the object or a control data
section including the programming to complete the job ticket represented by the object.

[4] Object representing the job ticket is accessed by the client

         The fourth limitation in question is that a client accesses the object representing the job
ticket.   The Examiner has again stated that Sklut teaches this limitation in its Abstract; in column
5, line 52 through column 7, line 51; in column 13, line 65 through column 14, line 17; and, in

column 15, lines 30-53. With respect to the Abstract of Sklut, as noted above, Sklut makes no mention of objects; therefore, Sklut cannot be said to disclose a client accessing an object representing the job ticket as limited in the claim language.

With respect to column 5, line 52 through column 7, line 51, as noted above, this excerpt of Sklut says that a *service* can be implemented as an object, as opposed to a service storing a *job ticket* as an object. Sklut is silent as to a client accessing this object. Furthermore, insofar as Sklut says here that the object represents the service, then this means that at best, and without employing impermissible hindsight, Sklut teaches that a client can access an object representing the service, as opposed to a client accessing an object representing a job ticket, as to which the claimed invention is limited. Thus, with respect to column 5, line 52 through column 7, line 51, this part of Sklut cannot be said to disclose a client accessing an object that represents a job ticket.

With respect to column 13, line 65 through column 14, line 17, as noted above, this excerpt of Sklut simply says that the *user interface* can be implemented as an object. Sklut is silent as to a client accessing this object. Furthermore, insofar as Sklut says here that the object implements a user interface, then this means at best, and without employing impermissible hindsight, Sklut teaches that a client can access an object implementing a user interface, as opposed to a client accessing an object representing a job ticket, as to which the claimed invention is limited. Thus, with respect to column 13, line 65 through column 14, line 17, this part of Sklut cannot be said to disclose a client accessing an object that represents a job ticket.

With final respect to column 15, lines 30-53 of Sklut, as noted above, this excerpt of Sklut also says that a *service* can be implemented as an object, as opposed to a service storing a *job ticket* as an object. Sklut is silent as to a client accessing this object. Furthermore, insofar as Sklut says here that the object represents the service, then this means that at best, and without employing impermissible hindsight, Sklut teaches that a client can access an object representing the service, as opposed to a client accessing an object representing a job ticket, as to

First named inventor: Oakeson   Page 16
Serial no. 09/873,194
Filed 6/5/2001
Attorney docket no. 10005667-1

which the claimed invention is limited. Thus, with respect to column 15, lines 30-53, this part of Sklut cannot be said to disclose a client accessing an object that represents a job ticket.

Claim rejections under 35 USC 103 as to claims 3-5 and 8-21

Claims 3-5 and 9-21 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huberman in view of Sklut, and further in view of Gindlesperger (6,397,197). Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huberman in view of Sklut, and further in view of Meltzer (6,125,391). Claims 3-5 and 9 are dependent claims depending from claim 1, and therefore are patentable at least insofar as claim 1 is. Claims 10, 17, and 21 are independent claims, from which the remaining claims rejected under 35 USC 103(a) ultimately depend. Claims 10, 17, and 21 each have similar limitations as claim 1 does. Therefore, claims 10, 17, and 21 are patentable over Huber in view of Sklut, and further in view of Gindlesperger and/or Meltzer, for at least the same reasons as to why claim 1 is patentable, and, as such, the claims depending from claims 10, 17, and 21 are patentable as well.

First named inventor: Oakeson   Page 17
Serial no. 09/873,194
Filed 6/5/2001
Attorney docket no. 10005667-1

Conclusion

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the pending claims in condition for allowance, and request that they so be allowed. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Mike Dryja, Applicant's representative, at 425-427-5094, so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

May 14, 2007
Date

Michael A. Dryja, Reg. No. 39,662
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Law Offices of Michael Dryja
704 228th Ave NE #694
Sammamish, WA 98074
tel: 425-427-5094, fax: 206-374-2819